

REMARKS

The amendments to the claims set forth above do not add new matter to the claims. Support for the amendment to claim 6 can be found in the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8 of the application. Support for new claim 24 can be found, for example, in original claim 12 and on page 22 of the specification. Other amendments correct or simplify claim dependencies.

In an Office Action dated April 15, 2004, the examiner asserted that then pending claims 1-23 were subject to a restriction requirement. He grouped the claims into nine different groups. The amendments to some of the claims and cancellation of other claims has made much of the restriction requirement moot. Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims now pending should be considered as a single invention. The sole independent claim now pending, claim 6, was part of Group II in the groupings of the claims set forth by the examiner in the Office Action. Claim 11 also was designated as being in Group II. Claims 8, 9, 13 and new claim 24 all depend from claim 6, and applicants request that these claims be considered with claim 6. Applicants also request that claim 20 be considered with claim 6, as the claim requires performance of a method of producing a peptide as claimed in claim 6 in combination with an additional step. The examiner acknowledged that method of treatment claim 18 could be grouped with method of production claims 1-5, now canceled, and applicants therefore submit that the claim also be can be considered with method of production claim 6. Claim 19 to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a peptide produced by one of the method claims, and Applicants request that this claim also be considered with claim 6.

In the Office Action, the examiner had asserted that the inventions set forth in original claims 1-23 did not relate to a single inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, although the technical feature linking the different groups appeared to be that they all relate to a bioactive peptide, Groups I-III and VII-IX are drawn to different methods, and the PCT Rules do not allow for multiple methods. Groups IV-VI also were said to be drawn to different structures with different functions. applicants respectfully submit that these objections have been obviated by the cancellation of a number of claims and the amendment of others. As noted above, all of the claims now are directed to, or relate back to, the method of producing a bioactive peptide as set forth in claim 6.

Applicants recognize that to be fully responsive to the Action they must elect a group as designated by the examiner. applicants thus hereby elect with traverse the claims of Group II, but request that the Group be modified to include claims 8, 9, 13, 18, 19, 20 and 24.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer Number or Bar Code Label 06449					
Name	Barbara G. Ernst, Reg. No. 30,377				
Signature	Barbara G. Ernst			Date	June 17, 2004
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.				
City	Washington	State	D.C.	Zip Code	20005
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	202-783-6040	Fax	202-783-6031